

December 22, 2004

Mr. Mark Graham, Examiner
U. S. Patent & Trademark Office
Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450



RE: Application Number: 10/767,318

Inventor: John B. Carilli

Dear Mr. Graham:

In the creation of my device, my original goal was to create a golf cup for portable above-ground artificial green surfaces (both sand-filled and non-sand-filled synthetic turf) that would most closely match the visual aesthetics, as well as working characteristics of a traditional standard in-ground golf cup to include with our synthetic golf greens we were then marketing.

My device's key and unique component is the removable flag stick with the loosely attached clear disc, fitted to just the right diameter and positioned to just the right height to act to stop the momentum of a golf ball's motion and retain the ball within the cup when used with a depth that is as little as that of a carpet or depth of a turf surface (with or without a foam backing) while still allowing the golf ball to freely roll once in the cups base.

When considering and comparing both Wuertemburg and Selton's inventions to our BentGreen Cup, I feel, and our research has proven, that I have created the right visual and working characteristics that more closely match that which a golfer would prefer as compared to a traditional golf cup hole location. We have not used or created an unnatural mechanical (perceived as an eyesore by a golfer) device (Wuertemburg) or less versatile device (Selton) which is limited in both it's use and application. In fact, I would welcome such a comparison of my device to both other inventions and let golfers decide which is more natural to the results they expect and is more overall visually appealing when comparing each to a regulation golf cup with flag stick inserted and containing a flag marker.

Our R&D has proven that my flat clear flange is less visually distracting (close up or far away) and putting to the device allows similar ball/golf cup action as found on natural golf greens. Specifically, if a ball is putted with the same direction and speed as on natural grass greens golf cups, our BentGreen Cup invention will result in a similar experience, holed putts that would normally fall and reject putts that would not fall. Additionally, one major distinctive difference between my invention when compared to both Wuertemburg and Selton's is my device has maintained the natural characteristic and ability of the ball to freely move and roll as expected once entering and remaining in the cups base, and is NOT being artificially held (unlike Wuertemburg and Selton) or prevented from its natural state of motion (continued motion or rolling once within the cup), also what is experienced with standard golf green cups.

In closing, my goal and the key feature I wanted to create was to make a cup that in every way could be compared to in-ground cups, not what was available in the current market, putting cups that did not have similar visual appeal or used some other (mostly unnatural and odd looking) mechanical device to act to stop and hold a golf ball. My goal also was to make the ball to act naturally and roll freely as found in a standard golf cup hole. In fact, a golfer putting on a natural in-ground cup hole can, with only audible feedback, know that a ball was holed. The sound created with the way our device is made does in fact give the golfer a similar feedback, unlike Wuertemburg or Selton, where the ball is stopped motionless and held in place and not allowed to roll freely, without giving any audible feedback. One other benefit of our device, unlike Wuertemburg and Selton, is that our device allows a ball to remain free once in the cups base (not held in position), a golfer can putt to the cup with multiple golf balls and more successfully use our device over Wuertemburg and Selton's inventions.

If my form in writing my claims is still not in an acceptable language, considering your professional knowledge and experience in examining correctly worded claims, could you possibly help guide me or help me write the claims in an acceptable form.

As mentioned by phone, I have included a sample of our device for your review and consideration of the facts before you and ask for you to compare my claims to the working models of both Wuertemburg and Selton and see that I have created a unique invention.

I look forward to your reply.

Best wishes,

John B. Carilli
Inventor